

REMARKS

[0002] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14, 16-28 and 30-36 are presently pending. Claims 1, 6, 7, 12-14, 16, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25-28, 30, 33, and 36 are amended herein. Claims 5, 10, 15, and 29 have been withdrawn or cancelled. No new claims are added herein.

Statement of Substance of Interview

[0003] Examiner Rutledge graciously met with me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—on May 27, 2008, at the USPTO. Applicant greatly appreciates the Examiner's willingness to meet. Such willingness is invaluable to both of us in our common goal of an expedited prosecution of this patent application.

[0004] During the interview, we discussed the rejections under § 101, and how the claims differ from the cited references, namely Price and Farrett. Without conceding the propriety of the rejections and in the interest of expediting prosecution, I also proposed several possible clarifying amendments.

[0005] The Examiner was receptive to the discussion, and I understood the Examiner to tentatively concur with the discussed clarifying amendments, subject to an updated search.

[0006] Applicant herein amends the claims consistent with the discussion during the interview. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the pending claims are allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons discussed during the interview.

Formal Request for an Interview

[0007] If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—so that we can talk about this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

[0008] Please contact me to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for me, I welcome your call as well. My contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

Claim Amendments

[0009] Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 1, 6, 7, 12-14, 16, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25-28, 30, 33, and 36 herein. Applicant amends claims to clarify claimed features. Such amendments are made to expedite prosecution and to more quickly identify allowable subject matter. Such amendments are merely intended to clarify the claimed features, and should not be construed as further limiting the claimed invention in response to the cited references.

[0010] The amendments are fully supported by the Application as originally filed. For example, support regarding “a date launch feature” can be found at least at page 12 and “gesture[s] commanding user defined functionality” can be found at least at page 22 of the Specification.

Substantive Matters

Claim Rejections under § 103

[0011] The Examiner rejects claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14, 16-28 and 30-36 under §103. For the reasons set forth below, the Examiner has not made a prima facie case showing that the rejected claims are obvious.

[0012] Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejections be withdrawn and the case be passed along to issuance.

[0013] The Examiner's rejections are based upon the following references in combination:

- **Price:** *Price, et al.*, Linking by Inking: Trailblazing in a Paper-like Hypertext, HyperText 98, Pittsburgh, PA, copyright ACM 1998, pp. 30-39;
- **Farrett:** *Farrett*, US Patent No. 7,107,261 (Issued Sep. 12, 2006); and
- **Haveliwala:** *Haveliwala, et al.*, Evaluating Strategies for Similarity Search on the Web, WWW2002, May 2002, pp. 432-442.

Overview of the Application

[0014] The Application describes managing annotations in pen-based computing systems. The systems and methods described provide ways to collect, manage, search and share personal information entered by way of handwritten annotations. Annotations are used to drive applications, serve as gestures, find related information, and to further manage information. Context information is obtained when a user enters an annotation, and is used to assist in determining and locating relevant content in which the user may

be interested, whether in the same document or a different document located on a local computer, on the Internet, or on another network.

Cited References

[0015] The Examiner cites Price as the primary reference, Farrett as the secondary reference, and Haveliwala as the tertiary reference in the obviousness-based rejections.

Price

[0016] Price is an article describing a technology for an interface for reader-directed link construction bridging reading and browsing activities. The article describes linking by inking as being developed in XLibris, a hypertext system based on the paper document metaphor. Readers use a pen computer to annotate page images with free-form ink, much as they would on paper, and the computer constructs hypertext links based on the ink marks. The article proposes two kinds of reader-directed links: automatic and manual. Automatic links are created in response to readers' annotations. The system extracts the text near free-form ink marks, uses these terms to construct queries, executes queries against a collection of documents, and displays links to related documents in the margin or as "further reading lists." The article also presents a design for manual (ad hoc) linking: circling an ink symbol generates a multi-way link to other instances of the same symbol.

Farrett

[0017] Farrett describes a client-side search engine that creates a user preference history record relative to a knowledge base. The more time the user spends using the

search engine, the more the history record is updated, refined, and translated into personal preferences relative to that knowledge base. The system of Farrett is natural language based and is applicable to a variety of knowledge bases, each which may have their own associated history record, and can be adapted to other applications such as on-line help, interactive training, wizard functions, virtual chat sessions, and intelligent bots.

Haveliwala

[0018] Haveliwala describes using Web hierarchies, such as Open Directory, for answering Related Pages queries on the Web. Haveliwala applies an evaluation methodology to a mix of document representation strategies, including the use of text, anchor-text, and links. The article discusses relative advantages and disadvantages of various approaches. Finally, the article describes how to efficiently construct a similarity index out of the authors' chosen strategies and provides sample results from the index.

Obviousness Rejections

Lack of *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness (MPEP § 2142)

[0019] Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's obviousness rejections. Arguments presented herein point to various aspects of the record to demonstrate that all of the criteria set forth for making a prima facie case have not been met.

Based upon Price in view of Farrett

[0020] The Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 6-9, 11-14, 19-28 and 30-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Price in view of Farrett. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims and asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

[0021] Furthermore, without conceding the propriety of the purported combinations or the propriety of the rejections, Applicant respectfully submits that amendments to the claims render the previous rejections moot.

Independent Claim 1

[0022] The cited references do not teach at least the following elements of claim 1 (as amended and with emphasis added):

A method of managing annotations in a pen-based computing system, the method comprising:

monitoring an electronic document for user annotations;

recognizing entry of an annotation into the electronic document;

collecting context data proximal to the annotation, wherein the context data comprises:

time;

location;

surrounding text;

determining whether the annotation comprises a gesture wherein the gesture is an ink object commanding user defined functionality of a computer;

determining whether the annotation is associated with a date;

responsive to determining the annotation is associated with a date, determining if a date launch feature is enabled, such that:

in an event no date launch feature is enabled, continuing monitoring the electronic document for user annotations;

in an event the date launch feature is enabled, launching an associated application;

* * *

using the keywords to locate information such that:

in an event a user-specified domain is selected, the keywords are used to locate information in one of a plurality of user-specified domains comprising:

a local computer;

a local network drive;

the Internet.

[0023] Neither Price nor Farrett in the context of managing annotations in a pen-based computing system teach “collecting context data . . . comprising: time; location; surrounding text,” as recited in the claim. Nor does either of the references teach or suggest “gestures” as recited in the claim; specifically “determining whether the annotation comprises a gesture wherein the gesture is an ink object commanding user defined functionality of a computer.” The cited references are silent regarding such user defined functionality.

[0024] Furthermore, neither of the references teaches “responsive to determining the annotation is associated with a date, determining if a date launch feature is enabled” and “launching an associated application,” as recited in the claim. The cited references are silent regarding such a date launch feature.

[0025] As shown above, the purported combination of Price and Farrett does not teach or suggest all of the claimed elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Independent Claims 14 and 23

[0026] Independent claims 14 and 23 each include at least one feature similar to the claimed features discussed above regarding claim 1. Thus, the combination of Price and Farrett does not teach or suggest independent claims 14 and 23 for at least similar reasons as discussed above regarding claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Dependent Claims 2, 6-13, 19-22, and 24-36

[0027] These claims each ultimately depend upon one of independent claims 1, 14, and 23. As discussed above, claims 1, 14, and 23 are allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

[0028] For example, regarding claim 13, none of the cited references teach or suggest at least “annotations are recognized from a plurality of types of annotations, the plurality of types of annotations comprising: circle; underline; block; arrow; callout; free note; and post-it note.”

[0029] Indeed, it appears that the types of annotations taught by Price are directed to reader-directed linking of three types: margin links, further reading lists, and ink anchors. Annotations in Price are limited to query construction: “*Circled phrases, underlines, and highlights select specific phrases; circles passages select corresponding sentences; and margin bars select nearby passages.*” Neither Farrett nor Haveliwala suggest or teach a remedy of this deficiency.

Based upon Price in view of Farrett and further in view of Haveliwala

[0030] The Examiner rejects claims 3, 4, and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Price in view of Farrett and further in view of Haveliwala. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims and asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

[0031] Claims 3 and 4 depend upon independent claim 1 and claims 16-18 depend from independent claim 14. As discussed above, claims 1 and 14 are allowable. Haveliwala fails to cure the deficiencies of the teachings of Price and Farrett with respect to the illustrated distinctions of claims 1 and 14. Additionally, it is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, claims 3, 4, and 16-18 may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

Dependent Claims

[0032] In addition to its own merits, each dependent claim is allowable for the same reasons that its base claim is allowable. Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of each dependent claim where its base claim is allowable.

Conclusion

[0033] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action. Please call/email me or my assistant at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC



Beatrice L. Koempel-Thomas (bea@leehayes.com; x259)
Registration No. 58213

Dated: 6/12/08

Kayla D. Brant (kayla@leehayes.com; x242)
Registration No. 46576

Telephone: (509) 324-9256
Facsimile: (509) 323-8979
www.leehayes.com